

### C. Remarks

The claims are 1-6, with claim 1 being the sole independent claim. Claim 1 has been amended for clarification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the present claims is expressly requested.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,992,974 (Miyata). Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Miyata. The grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

The present invention relates to a method for manufacturing a liquid jet recording head. In this method, the top plate is anisotropically etched through a mask layer and the liquid chamber is formed to have a substantially rectangular shape at the nozzle surface of the top plate by over-etching portions with the compensation patterns. These compensation patterns are formed so that they extend into the liquid chamber region (See, e.g., Fig. 2A and page 15, line 16 - page 16, line 10).

Miyata is directed to an ink-jet head having nozzle openings through which ink droplets are discharged. Applicant respectfully submits that Miyata fails to disclose or suggest forming compensation patterns that extend into a liquid chamber region, which patterns are then used to anisotropically etch and over-etch the top plate to form, for example, the liquid chamber. This reference teaches using silicon dioxide layers 41 and 41' (Fig. 5d) to form the nozzle and the ink reservoir by anisotropic etching (Fig. 7(b)).<sup>1</sup> These silicon dioxide layers clearly do not extend into the liquid chamber region. Accordingly, it

---

<sup>1</sup> /The Examiner will note that another silicon dioxide layer 41 below the monocrystalline substrate 40 cannot be deemed a compensation pattern, because it is not used for overetching. Also, this silicon dioxide layer is not formed on an anisotropic-etching mask layer.


is clear that Miyata cannot anticipate the presently claimed invention or render it unpatentable.

Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the above rejections be withdrawn and the present application be passed to issue.

This Amendment After Final Rejection should be entered, because it places the case in allowable form. It is clear that the change made in claim 1 does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search. Alternatively, this Amendment places the case in better form for possible appeal.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,512

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 343781v1